arXiv:1606.08362v1 [cs.DS] 27 Jun 2016

A Reduction for Optimizing Lattice Submodular Functions with Diminishing Returns

Alina Ene * Huy L. Nguyen†

June 28, 2016

Abstract

A function $f : \mathbb{Z}_+^E \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is DR-submodular if it satisfies $f(\mathbf{x}+\chi_i)-f(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{y}+\chi_i)-f(\mathbf{y})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}, i \in E$. Recently, the problem of maximizing a DR-submodular function $f : \mathbb{Z}_+^E \to \mathbb{R}_+$ subject to a budget constraint $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq B$ as well as additional constraints has received significant attention [6, 7, 5, 8].

In this note, we give a generic reduction from the DR-submodular setting to the submodular setting. The running time of the reduction and the size of the resulting submodular instance depends only *logarithmically* on B. Using this reduction, one can translate the results for unconstrained and constrained submodular maximization to the DR-submodular setting for many types of constraints in a unified manner.

1 Introduction

Recently, constrained submodular optimization has attracted a lot of attention as a common abstraction of a variety of tasks in machine learning ranging from feature selection, exemplar clustering to sensor placement. Motivated by the use cases where there is a large budget of identical items, a generalization of submodular optimization to integer lattice is proposed by [6]. Previously, submodular functions has been generalized to lattices via the lattice submodular property. A function $f : \mathbb{Z}_+^E \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is *lattice submodular* if for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E$,

$$f(\mathbf{x}) + f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) + f(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y})$$

In the generalization due to [6, 7], a function f is *DR-submodular* if it satisfies

$$f(\mathbf{x} + \chi_i) - f(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{y} + \chi_i) - f(\mathbf{y})$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}, i \in E$ (diminishing return property), where χ_i is the vector in $\{0,1\}^E$ that has a 1 in the coordinate corresponding to i and 0 in all other coordinates.

It can be shown that any DR-submodular function is also lattice submodular (but the reverse direction is not necessarily true). Similar to submodular functions, the applications can be formulated as maximizing a DR-submodular function f subject to constraints, such as a budget constraint $\max\{f(\mathbf{x}) \colon \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E, \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq B\}$. While it is straightforward to reduce optimization of

*Department of Computer Science and DIMAP, University of Warwick, A.Ene@warwick.ac.uk.

†Toyota Technological Institute at Chicago, hlnguyen@cs.princeton.edu.

DR-submodular function with budget constraint B to optimization of submodular function with $B \cdot E$ items, the goal of [6] is to find algorithms for this setting with running time *logarithmic* in B rather than *polynomial* in B, which follows from the straightforward reduction. Following [6], there have been several works extending problems involving submodular functions to the DR-submodular setting [7, 5, 8].

In this note, we give a generic reduction from the DR-submodular setting to the submodular setting. The running time of the reduction and the size of the resulting submodular instance depends only *logarithmically* on B. Using this reduction, one can translate the results for unconstrained and constrained submodular maximization to the DR-submodular setting for many types of constraints in a unified manner.

2 The Reduction

Lemma 1. *For any n, there is a decomposition $n = a_1 + a_2 + \ldots + a_t$ with $t \leq 2\log n + 1$ so that for any $q \leq n$, there is a way to express q as the sum of a subset of the multiset $\{a_1, \ldots, a_t\}$.*

Proof. Let $n = b_0 2^0 + b_1 2^1 + \ldots + b_m 2^m$ be the binary representation of n with $b_m = 1$. Let $b_{c_1}, b_{c_2}, ..., b_{c_p}$ be all the non-zeroes among $b_0, \ldots, b_{m-1}$. Let $a_1 = 1$, $a_i = 2^{i-2}$ for $2 \leq i \leq m+1$, and $a_{m+1+j} = b_{c_j} 2^{c_j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq p$. It is clear that $\sum_{i \leq m+1} a_i = 2^m$ and $\sum_i a_i = n$.

Consider an arbitrary number $1 < q < n$. Let j be the largest bit that is 1 for n but it is 0 for q (j must exist because $q < n$). Let r be the number that agrees with n on all bits larger or equal to j and has all 0s for the smaller bits. We can form r from $a_1, \ldots, a_{m+1}$ (which sum up to 2^m) and the additional numbers from $\{a_{m+2}, \ldots, a_{m+1+p}\}$ corresponding to the bits equal to 1 from j to $m-1$ in the binary representation of r. Notice that $r - q < 2^m$ and it can be written as a sum of numbers from $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1}$ (just $(r-q)$'s binary representation). By removing those numbers from the representation of q above, we obtain a subset of the a_i's that sums to q. □

Corollary 2. *For any n, there is a way to write $n = a_1 + a_2 + \ldots + a_t$ with $t \leq 2\log n + 1 + 1/\epsilon$ so that $a_i \leq \epsilon n \ \forall i$ and for any $q \leq n$, there is a way to express q as the sum of a subset of the multiset $\{a_1, \ldots, a_t\}$.*

Proof. We start with the decomposition of the above lemma and refine it until the condition $a_i \leq \epsilon n \ \forall i$ is satisfied. As long as there exists some $a_i > \epsilon n$, replace a_i with two new numbers $a_i - \epsilon n$ and ϵn. Each replacement step produces a new term equal to ϵn so the number of replacement steps is at most $1/\epsilon$. Thus, the number of terms in the decomposition is at most $2\log n + 1 + 1/\epsilon$. □

The reduction. Suppose we need to optimize f over the domain $[B_1] \times [B_2] \times \cdots \times [B_E]$. By the above lemma, we can write $B_i = a_{i,1} + \ldots + a_{i,t_i}$ with $t_i \leq 2\log B_i + 1$ and any number at most B_i can be written as a sum of a subset of the $\{a_{i,j}\}_j$'s. Let $t = \sum_i t_i$. Consider a function g defined on the ground set $E' = \bigcup_{i \in E} \{(i,1), \ldots, (i,t_i)\}$ defined as follows. Consider $\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^{E'}$. Let $x_i = \sum_j y_{i,j} a_j$ and we define $g(\mathbf{y}) := f(\mathbf{x})$.

By Lemma 1, for any vector $\mathbf{x}$, there is a vector $\mathbf{y}$ such that $x_i = \sum_j y_{i,j} a_{i,j}$ for all i. Thus, the set $\{g(\mathbf{y})\}_{\mathbf{y}}$ captures all of $\{f(\mathbf{x})\}_{\mathbf{x}}$. Next, we show that g is submodular.

Lemma 3. *The function g is submodular.*

Proof. Consider 2 vectors $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}' \in \{0,1\}^{E'}$ such that $y_{i,j} \leq y'_{i,j}$ for all i, j. Consider an arbitrary element $(i_0, j_0) \in E'$ that is not in $\mathbf{y}'$. Let $\mathbf{x}$ defined as $x_i = \sum_j y_{i,j} a_{i,j}$ and $\mathbf{x}'$ defined as $x'_i = \sum_j y'_{i,j} a_{i,j}$. We have $g(\mathbf{y} + \chi_{(i_0,j_0)}) - g(\mathbf{y}) = f(\mathbf{x} + a_{i_0,j_0}\chi_{i_0}) - f(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{y}' + \chi_{(i_0,j_0)}) - g(\mathbf{y}') = f(\mathbf{x}' + a_{i_0,j_0}\chi_{i_0}) - f(\mathbf{x}')$. By the diminishing return property, we have

$$f(\mathbf{x} + a_{i_0,j_0}\chi_{i_0}) - f(\mathbf{x}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}' + a_{i_0,j_0}\chi_{i_0}) - f(\mathbf{x}').$$

□

3 Modeling Constraints

We are interested in maximizing $f(\mathbf{x})$ subject to constraints. In this section, we show how to translate constraints on $\mathbf{x}$ to constraints for maximizing $g(\mathbf{y})$.

Cardinality constraint. The constraint $\sum_i x_i \leq K$ with $K > 1/\epsilon$ can be translated to

$$\sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} y_{i,j} \leq K.$$

By applying Corollary 2, we map from a cardinality constraint to a knapsack constraint where all weights are at most an ϵ fraction of the budget.

Knapsack constraint. The knapsack constraint $\sum_i c_i x_i \leq K$ can be translated to

$$\sum_{i,j} c_i a_{i,j} y_{i,j} \leq K.$$

General constraints. Consider the problem $\max\{f(\mathbf{x})\colon \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}\}$, where $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [B_1] \times [B_2] \times \ldots \times [B_E]$ denotes the set of all solutions that satisfy the constraints.

We can apply algorithmic frameworks from the submodular setting — such as the frameworks based on continuous relaxations and rounding [9, 3] — to the DR-submodular setting as follows. Let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^E$ be a relaxation of $\mathcal{I}$ that satisfies the following conditions:

- $\mathcal{P}$ is downward-closed: if $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{P}$ then $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}$.
- There is a separation oracle for $\mathcal{P}$: given $\mathbf{x}$, there is an oracle that either correctly decides that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}$ or otherwise returns a hyperplane separating $\mathbf{x}$ from $\mathcal{P}$, i.e., a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^E$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq D$ and $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} \rangle < D$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{P}$.

We apply Lemma 1 (or Corollary 2) to obtain the multiset $\{a_{i,j}\}_{i,j}$ such that, for any vector $\mathbf{x}$, there is a vector $\mathbf{y}$ such that $x_i = \sum_j y_{i,j} a_{i,j}$ for all i. Define the linear function $M : \mathbb{R}^{E'} \to \mathbb{R}^E$ where $\mathbf{x} = M(\mathbf{y})$ is computed according to $x_i = \sum_j y_{i,j} a_{i,j}$ $\forall i$. Let $g : 2^{E'} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be the submodular function given by the reduction. Let $G : [0,1]^{E'} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be the multilinear extension of g:

$$G(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbb{E}[g(R(\mathbf{y}))],$$

where $R(\mathbf{y})$ is a random set that contains each element $e \in E'$ independently at random with probability y_e.

Thus we obtain the following fractional problem: $\max\{G(\mathbf{y})\colon \mathbf{y} \in [0,1]^{E'}, M(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{P}\}$. As shown in the following lemma, we can use the separation oracle for $\mathcal{P}$ to maximize a linear objective $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y} \rangle$, where $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{E'}$, subject to the constraints $\mathbf{y} \in [0,1]^{E'}$ and $M(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{P}$.

Lemma 4. *Using the separation oracle for $\mathcal{P}$ and an algorithm such as the ellipsoid method, for any vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{E'}$, one can find in polynomial time a vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{E'}$ that maximizes $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y} \rangle$ subject to $\mathbf{y} \in [0,1]^{E'}$ and $M(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. It suffices to verify that the separation oracle for $\mathcal{P}$ allows us to separate over $\{\mathbf{y}\colon \mathbf{y} \in [0,1]^{E'}, M(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{P}\}$. To this end, let $\mathbf{y}$ be a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{E'}$. Separation for the constraint $\mathbf{y} \in [0,1]^{E'}$ can be done trivially by checking if every coordinate of $\mathbf{y}$ is in $[0,1]$. Thus, we focus on separation for the constraint $M(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{P}$. Using the separation oracle for $\mathcal{P}$, we can check whether $M(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{P}$. If yes, then we are done. Otherwise, the oracle returns $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{E}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\langle \mathbf{v}, M(\mathbf{y}) \rangle \geq D$ and $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} \rangle < D$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $\mathbf{v}' \in \mathbb{R}^{E'}$ be $\mathbf{v}' = M^*(\mathbf{v})$, where M^* is the adjoint of M i.e. $v'_{i,j} = a_{i,j} v_i \ \forall i, j$. Then $\langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{y} \rangle = \langle M^*(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{y} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}, M(\mathbf{y}) \rangle \geq D$. Now let $\mathbf{y}'$ be a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{E'}$ such that $M(\mathbf{y}') \in \mathcal{P}$. We have $\langle \mathbf{v}', \mathbf{y}' \rangle = \langle M^*(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{y}' \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}, M(\mathbf{y}') \rangle < D$. Thus $(\mathbf{v}', D)$ is a hyperplane separating $\mathbf{y}$ from $\{\mathbf{y}'\colon M(\mathbf{y}') \in \mathcal{P}\}$. □

Since we can solve $\max\{\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y} \rangle : \mathbf{y} \in [0,1]^{E'}, M(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{P}\}$, where $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{E'}$, we can approximately solve the fractional problem $\max\{G(\mathbf{y})\colon \mathbf{y} \in [0,1]^{E'}, M(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{P}\}$ using the (measured) Continuous Greedy algorithm or local search [9, 3, 4].

We note that in some settings, such as when $\mathcal{P}$ is a polymatroid polytope[1], we can round the resulting fractional solution to the problem $\max\{G(\mathbf{y})\colon M(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{P}\}$ and obtain an integral solution (similarly to [8]); in this case, the rounding preserves the value of the fractional solution and thus we obtain an α-approximation for the problem $\max\{f(\mathbf{x})\colon \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}\}$, where $\alpha = 1 - 1/e$ for monotone functions and $\alpha = 1/e$ for non-monotone functions. The detailed proof is in Theorem 7.

Some examples of results. Using the reduction above, we immediately get algorithms for maximizing DR-submodular functions subject to various types of constraints. We include a few examples below.

Theorem 5. *There is a $1/2$ approximation algorithm for unconstrained DR-submodular maximization with running time $O(n + \sum_i \log B_i)$.*

Proof. By the reduction using Lemma 1, we need to solve an unconstrained submodular maximization with $O(n + \sum_i \log B_i)$ items. The result follows from applying the Double Greedy algorithm of [2] to the resulting instance of unconstrained submodular maximization. □

Theorem 6. *There is a $1 - 1/e - \epsilon$ approximation algorithm for maximizing a monotone DR-submodular function subject to a cardinality constraint B with running time $O(m \log(m/\epsilon)/\epsilon)$ where $m = n/\epsilon + \sum_i \log B_i$.*

Proof. If $B \leq 1/\epsilon$, the result follows via the trivial reduction of making B copies of every item. Next, we consider the case $B > 1/\epsilon$. By the reduction using Corollary 2, we need to solve a submodular maximization problem with a knapsack constraint where all weights are at most ϵ times the budget and there are $O(n/\epsilon + \sum_i \log B_i)$ items. The result follows from applying the Density Greedy algorithm with either descending thresholds or lazy evaluation [1]. □

[1]Let $\rho : 2^E \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ be a monotone submodular function with $\rho(\emptyset) = 0$. The polymatroid associated with ρ is the polytope $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^E_+\colon \sum_{i \in S} x_i \leq \rho(S) \quad \forall S \subseteq E\}$.

Theorem 7. *There is an α approximation algorithm for maximizing a DR-submodular function subject to a polymatroid constraint with running time that is polynomial in n and $\sum_i \log B_i$, where $\alpha = 1 - 1/e$ if the function is monotone and $\alpha = 1/e$ otherwise.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the polymatroid polytope. We apply Lemma 1 (or Corollary 2) to obtain the multiset $\{a_{i,j}\}_{i,j}$ such that, for any vector $\mathbf{x}$, there is a vector $\mathbf{y}$ such that $x_i = \sum_j y_{i,j} a_j$ for all i. Let $g : 2^{E'} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be the submodular function given by the reduction. Let $G : [0,1]^{E'} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be the multilinear extension of g.

Since we can separate over $\mathcal{P}$ in polynomial time using a submodular minimization algorithm, it follows from Lemma 4 that we can optimize any linear (in $\mathbf{y}$) objective over $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $x_i \le B_i$ for all $i \in E$, where $\mathbf{x} = M(\mathbf{y})$. Therefore, using the measured Continous Greedy algorithm, we can find an α-approximate fractional solution to the problem $\max\{G(\mathbf{y}) \colon \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}, x_i \le B_i \ \forall i \in E\}$, where $\alpha = 1 - 1/e$ for monotone functions and $\alpha = 1/e$ for non-monotone functions. Similarly to [8], we can round the resulting fractional solution without any loss in the approximation. Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^E$ be defined as $z_i = \lfloor x_i \rfloor$. Define $H : [0,1]^E \to \mathbb{R}$ as $H(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}_R[f(\mathbf{z} + R(\mathbf{v}))]$ for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^E$. Note that H is the multilinear extension of a submodular function agreeing with H on $\{0,1\}^E$.

Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^E$ be defined as $v_i = x_i - \lfloor x_i \rfloor$. First one can show that $H(\mathbf{v}) \ge G(\mathbf{y})$ via a hybrid argument. Let $\mathbf{z}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{Z}^E$ be a random integral vector whose first i coordinates are distributed according to $M(R(\mathbf{y}))$ (that is, constructing a randomized rounding of $\mathbf{y}$ and then converting it to an integral vector in $\mathbb{Z}^E$) and the last $|E| - i$ coordinates are picked randomly among $\{z_i, z_i + 1\}$ so that the expectation is x_i. Note that $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{z}^{(0)})] = H(\mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{z}^{(|E|)})] = G(\mathbf{y})$ and we will show that $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{z}^{(i-1)})] \ge \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{z}^{(i)})]$. Indeed, for all $j \ne i$, $\mathbf{z}_j^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{z}_j^{(i-1)}$ are identically distributed so we can couple the randomness so that $\mathbf{z}_j^{(i)} = \mathbf{z}_j^{(i-1)}$ $\forall j \ne i$. Let $\mathbf{w}$ be $\mathbf{z}^{(i)}$ with the ith coordinate zeroed out and define a single variable function $g : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$ where $g(x) = f(\mathbf{w} + x \cdot e_i)$. Define $g' : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be the piecewise linear function agreeing with g on integral points and g' does not have any break points other than integral points. By the DR property of f, we have that g' is concave. Thus, $\mathbb{E}[g'(\mathbf{z}_i^{(i)})] \le g'(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_i^{(i)}])$. On the other hand, because g' is linear in $[z_i, z_i + 1]$, we have $\mathbb{E}[g'(\mathbf{z}_i^{(i-1)})] = g'(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_i^{(i-1)}]) = g'(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}_i^{(i)}])$.

Next as done in [8, Lemma 13], one can show that the constraints $\mathbf{v} \in [0,1]^E, \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}$ are equivalent to a matroid polytope. Thus, one can round $\mathbf{v}$ to an integral vector without losing any value in H using strategies such as pipage rounding or swap rounding. □

4 The DR-Submodular Cover Problem

We conclude this note with some remarks on the DR-submodular cover problem. In this problem, the goal is to minimize the cost $c(\mathbf{x})$ subject to the constraint $f(\mathbf{x}) \ge \alpha$ where f is a DR-submodular function and the cost c is a modular function. This problem has been considered in [7] (in fact, they even consider a more general setting where c is a subadditive function) but there is a mistake in the proof. The proof of [7, Claim 5.2] uses the equality $f(\mathbf{x}^*) = f(\mathbf{x}_L)$, which is incorrect since it could happen that $f(\mathbf{x}_L) > f(\mathbf{x}^*)$. Note that this equality is correct for the usual special case where $\alpha = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}} f(\mathbf{x})$ but not for the general case considered in [7].

Algorithm 1 in [7] in fact fails even for the case where both c and f are modular. For instance, consider $E = \{1, 2\}$, $f(\emptyset) = 0, f(\{1\}) = M, f(\{2\}) = 1, f(\{1,2\}) = M + 1$, $c(\{1\}) = M, c(\{2\}) = 1$, $\alpha = 1$. The algorithm first picks element 1 as it has the highest density ratio, and then breaks the

loop as it realizes f is already exceeding $\alpha = 1$. However, the cost of the solution is M, which is arbitrarily larger than the optimal cost, which is 1 for the solution $\{2\}$.

Nevertheless, it is known that submodular cover can be reduced to submodular maximization with a knapsack constraint so we can obtain algorithms for DR-submodular objective via the reduction in the previous section.

References

[1] Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru and Jan Vondrák. Fast algorithms for maximizing submodular functions. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1497–1514, 2014.

[2] Niv Buchbinder, Moran Feldman, Joseph Naor, and Roy Schwartz. A tight linear time (1/2)-approximation for unconstrained submodular maximization. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 44(5):1384–1402, 2015.

[3] Chandra Chekuri, Jan Vondrák, and Rico Zenklusen. Submodular function maximization via the multilinear relaxation and contention resolution schemes. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 43(6):1831–1879, 2014.

[4] Moran Feldman, Joseph Naor, and Roy Schwartz. A unified continuous greedy algorithm for submodular maximization. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 570–579, 2011.

[5] Takanori Maehara, Akihiro Yabe, JP NEC, and Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi. Budget allocation problem with multiple advertisers: A game theoretic view. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 428–437, 2015.

[6] Tasuku Soma, Naonori Kakimura, Kazuhiro Inaba, and Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi. Optimal budget allocation: Theoretical guarantee and efficient algorithm. In *Proceedings of The 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 351–359, 2014.

[7] Tasuku Soma and Yuichi Yoshida. A generalization of submodular cover via the diminishing return property on the integer lattice. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 847–855, 2015.

[8] Tasuku Soma and Yuichi Yoshida. Maximizing monotone submodular functions over the integer lattice. In *International Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (IPCO)*, pages 325–336, 2016.

[9] Jan Vondrák. Optimal approximation for the submodular welfare problem in the value oracle model. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 67–74, 2008.